



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,339	07/01/2005	Kiyofumi Fukasawa	121036-0085	7740
35684	7590	09/19/2008	EXAMINER	
BUTZEL LONG			EGWIM, KELECHII CHIDI	
IP DOCKETING DEPT			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
350 SOUTH MAIN STREET			1796	
SUITE 300				
ANN ARBOR, MI 48104				
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		09/19/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATENT@BUTZEL.COM
BOUDRIE@BUTZEL.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/541,339	Applicant(s) FUKASAWA ET AL.
	Examiner Dr. Kelechi C. Egwim	Art Unit 1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 June 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1,14,15 and 17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 2,4-13 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/1449/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 07/01/2005.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of Group II, claims 2, 4-13 and 16 in the reply filed on 06/09/2008 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
2. Claims 1, 14, 15 and 17 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 2, 5, 6 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
5. Claim 2 recites the limitation "the phenol resin emulsion comprises ... 3 to 40% of methyl ethyl ketone" in claim 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation

in the claim as claim 16 defines "the content of methyl ethyl ketone being not more than 10 wt.%" in the emulsion.

6. Claims 5 and 6 provide for the use of the phenol resin, claim 11 provides for the use of hexarnethylenetetramine and claims 12 and 13 provide for the use of water, but, since these claims does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites "use" or "used" without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 5, 6 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2, 4-13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warren (USPN 5,200,455), Suzuki et al. (JP 06306340) or Eguchi et al. JP 61278579, each in combination with Tsuji et al. (USPN 5,346,957), Moriyama et al. (JP 2002194060) and Hagiwara et al. (JP 05025451), individually

In col. 2, lines 46-55, col. 4, lines 22-34, col. 6, lines 51-57 and col. 7, lines 61-63 Warren teaches composite of rubber and metal material bonded with a vulcanizable aqueous adhesive comprising a phenol resin emulsion with as little 5% of an organic solvent for the phenol resin, an aqueous water-soluble polymeric substance solution, and a curing agent, such as hexamethylenetetramine, for the phenol resin.

In the abstracts, Suzuki et al. and Eguchi et al. each individually teach vulcanizable aqueous adhesive for composites comprising a phenol resin emulsion with an organic solvent for the phenol resin, an aqueous water-soluble polymeric substance solution, and a curing agent, such as hexamethylenetetramine, for the phenol resin.

Each of Warren, Suzuki et al. or Eguchi et al. differ from the claimed invention in that they do not specify methyl ethyl ketone as the solvent for the phenol resin. However, it is known in the art to use methyl ethyl ketone as a solvent for phenol resin in adhesive applications, such as taught by Tsuji et al. (col. 6, lines 44-46), Moriyama et al. (see abstract) and Hagiwara et al. (see abstract), in order to provide good dissolution for the resin.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to use methyl ethyl ketone as the solvent for the phenol resin in the vulcanizable adhesive of Warren, Suzuki et al. or Eguchi et al. in

order to obtain the advantages taught by Tsuji et al., Moriyama et al. or Hagiwara et al., motivated by a reasonable expectation of success.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Kelechi C. Egwim whose telephone number is (571) 272-1099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T (7:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dr. Kelechi C. Egwim/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

KCE